

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 4 and 8 to more clearly claim the Applicant's invention and the support for such amendment is found in paragraphs. Claim 5 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-8 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Response to Arguments**

The Applicant appreciates the thoroughness of the Examiner's response and the logic of his arguments.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art in view of Meier, et al. (US 2001/0027478). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant's present application discloses addressing the problem of routing a service request when more than one identifier (of the called party) is obtained, especially when these identifiers can relate to different service types and/or addresses to different network domains. Specifically, a request is received that includes a first identifier that is related to a plurality of other identifiers associated with a destination user. The plurality of identifiers is obtained and a second identifier, associated with the destination user, that contains a user-name portion and a domain-name portion, is selected to route the request. The second identifier has a format that is formatted the same as the first identifier. In the case of legacy systems, the commonality of the use of the user-name portion and the domain-name portion in the first identifier and the second identifier allows the formation of a routable Full Qualified Domain Name (FQDN) which distinguishes the second identifier from the other stored identifiers (para. [0032]).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Meier reference does not disclose the identifier relationships as recited by claim 1. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, analogous claim 6 and the respective dependent claims 2-4 and 7-8 are allowable over the combination of the AAPA and Meier references.

Additionally, with regard to claim 4 as noted above the Applicant has amended claims 4 and 8 to clarify the subject matter in the claims. The Meier reference is cited against claims 4 and 8 for disclosing the use of Number Portability; of identifiers (e.g., SIP-URL identifiers) that comprise a fixed/permanent user-name portion containing a permanent identifier of a user and a variable domain-name portion containing, e.g., the domain name of the operator where the final user ("John Smith") has been ported. According to Meier, the user-name portion of a user identifier would remain the same whether or not it is subject to number portability, in which case only the domain-name portion would vary.

On the other hand the Meier reference does not disclose that the user-name portion of an identifier of a user can contain additional NP information.

The portion of the Meier reference cited in rejecting claim 4 describes the potential of NP (telephone number portability); that is, that everyone may be given a telephone number or email address that will remain the same throughout their lives (e.g. paragraphs [1753] - [1755]). However, Meier ignores the problem of signaling flows due to Number Portability (NP). Meier provides an alternative NP solution for groups of subscribers, or countries (that are not subject to Number Portability) or ISPs (e.g. paragraph [1754]). According to currently existing procedures, specific queries are sent from nodes routing service requests for obtaining NP information. And, Meier does not disclose the use of NP information incorporated in the second identifier with the first identifier.

The Detailed action noted on page 11 that the VARIATION cited in the Meier reference would encourage any person having ordinary skills in the art to design the second identifier with the same format as the first identifier. The Applicant respectfully submits that keeping the user-name portion the same as the portable phone number for


life would not necessarily guarantee the unique routing identifier even if the ISPs change. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 4 and 8.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 21, 2009

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com